

REMARKS

This Reply accompanies a Request for Continuing Examination (RCE) and is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on June 27, 2007 in which claims 10 and 18 were allowed and in which claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-16 and 19-21 were rejected. With this response, claims 5 and 20 - 21 are canceled; and 1, 12, 13 and 19 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 44, 6, 10, 12-16 and 18-19 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Objection to the Specification/Title

Page 2 of the Office Action objected to the title asserting that the title is not descriptive. The Office Action suggested the title "Media Handling Device Utilizing Independent Offset Cups On A Support".

Applicant respectfully notes that the suggested title is also not descriptive as it contains limitations not present in all of the claims. Not all the claims recite cups, nor do all of the claims recite a support or that the cups are independent. Nevertheless, in an attempt to further prosecution, the title is amended to recite "MEDIA HANDLING USING OFFSET CUPS OR SUCTION MEMBERS". Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to the specification/title be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claim 19 under 35 USC 102(b) Based upon a Wirz

Claim 19, as amended, recites a method for handling print media. The method includes rotating a drum carrying a sheet of print media and gripping the sheet of print media at different locations of the print media while the sheet of print media is supported by the drum, the different locations being disposed along a line orthogonal to a direction of movement of the print media such that the sheet of print media has a corrugated cross-section along the line orthogonal to a direction of movement.

Wirz fails to disclose or suggest a method in which a drum carrying a sheet of print media is rotated and the sheet of print media is gripped at different locations while the sheet of print

media supported by the drum, the different locations being disposed along a line orthogonal to a direction of movement of the print media such that the sheet of print media has a corrugated cross-section along the line orthogonal to a direction of movement. In fact, Wirz appears to teach away from any such configuration. (See Wirz, column 1, 16-18 and lines 39-41). Accordingly, claim 19, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Wirz.

III. Rejection of Claims 20-21 under 35 USC 102(b) Based upon a Becker

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected claims 20-21 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Becker US Patent 4,024,814. Claims 20-21 are canceled, rendering the rejection moot.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-14 and 16-17 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Krueger and Hudson

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-14 and 16-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger US Patent 2,231,339 in view of Hudson et al. US Patent Publication 2004/0113349. Applicant notes that claim 17 was previously canceled. Claim 5 is canceled with its limitations incorporated into base claim 1. Claims 1-2, 4, 13-14 and 16, as amended, overcome the rejection.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of former claim 5. Claim 1, as amended, recites a conveyor for transferring print media from cups plea print engine. Claim 1 further recites a drum for advancing the print media from the print engine to the cups, wherein the cups are configured to engage the print media while the media is supported by the drum and to lift the print media off the drum.

Neither Krueger nor Hudson, alone or in combination, disclose a drum for advancing print media from the print engine to cups, wherein the cups are configured to engage the print

media while the media is supported by the drum and to lift the print media off the drum. In contrast, Krueger merely discloses the use of suckers to pick an individual sheet of metal from a stack of such sheets. Nowhere does Krueger ever mention that these suckers are used to pick a sheet from a drum. In fact, since the whole objective of Krueger is to avoid one sheet of a stack from sticking to another sheet of a stack, Krueger is not even related to the same issues.

Hudson fails to satisfy these noted deficiencies of Krueger with respect to claim 1. Nowhere does Hudson even mention the possible use of cups or a drum for advancing print media to cups, wherein the cups are configured to engage the print media while the media is supported by the drum and to lift the print media off the drum. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection and is presented for consideration and allowance. Claims 2 and 4-5 depend from claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 13

Claim 13, as amended, recites an imaging device which includes a drum configured to support the medium in an arc at least partially about the drum as the drum transports the medium and suction members configured to adhere to a medium AFTER a print engine has formed an image onto the medium and while the medium is at least partially about the drum.

Neither Krueger nor Hudson, alone or in combination, discloses suction members configured to adhere to a medium after a print engine has formed an image on the medium and while the medium is at least partially about the drum. In contrast, Krueger merely discloses the use of suckers to pick an individual sheet of metal from a stack of such sheets. Nowhere does Krueger ever mention that these suckers are used to pick a sheet AFTER a print engine has formed an image onto the medium and while the medium is at least partially about the drum. As previously noted, Krueger does not even disclose a print engine as it relates to picking sheets of the sheet metal.

Hudson fails to satisfy these noted deficiencies of Krueger with respect to claim 13. Although Hudson describes a liquid electrophotography print engine and a drum 22, nowhere

does Hudson even mention the possible use of suction members configured to adhere to a medium after the liquid electrophotography print engine has formed an image on the medium and while the medium is at least partially about the drum.

Moreover, it would not be obvious to modify Krueger based upon Hudson as they are not analogous fields. One of ordinary skill in the art of handling a sheet metal would not look to liquid electrophotography print engine technology.

Furthermore, even assuming, arguendo, that it would be obvious to combine Krueger and Hudson, the resulting hypothetical combination would still fail to disclose suction members configured to adhere to a medium AFTER a print engine has formed an image on the medium and while the medium is at least partially about the drum. Accordingly, claim 13, as amended, overcomes the rejection.. The rejection of claim 16, which depends from claim 13, should be withdrawn for the same reasons.

V. Rejection of Claims 6 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Krueger, Hudson and Tajima

Page 4 of the Office Action rejected claims 6 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger US Patent 2,231,339 in view of Hudson et al. US Patent Publication 2004/0113349 and further in view of Tajima Japanes 62-215441. Claim 6 is amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 15 depends from claim 13 claims 6 and 15 and overcomes the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 13 based upon Krueger and Hudson. Tajima fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Krueger and Hudson. Like Krueger, Hudson merely diseloses suckers for lifting a topmost sheet from a stack of sheets.

VI. Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Krueger and Wirz

Page 4 of the Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wirz US Patent 4,378,734. For the reasons which follow, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Claim 12, as amended, recites an assembly for handling the sheet material which includes a drum positioned adjacent to coupling members for delivering sheet material to the coupling members, wherein the coupling members are configured to engage the print media while the sheet material is supported by the drum and to lift the print media off the drum, claim 12 further recites that at least one of the coupling members is disposed a first distance from the axis of rotation and another of the coupling members is disposed a second distance from the axis of rotation, the first and second distances being different.

Neither Krueger nor Wirz, alone or in combination, discloses a drum adjacent to coupling members. Neither Krueger nor Wirz discloses such a drum that advances print media from the print engine to the coupling members, wherein the coupling members are configured to engage the print media while the sheet material is supported by the drum and to lift the print media off the drum. In contrast, Krueger merely discloses the use of suckers to pick an individual sheet of metal from a stack of such sheets. Nowhere does Krueger ever mention that these suckers are used to pick a sheet from a drum. In fact, since the whole objective of Krueger is to avoid one sheet of a stack from sticking to another sheet of a stack, Krueger is not even related to the same issues.

Wirz fails to satisfy these noted deficiencies of Krueger with respect to claim 12. Moreover, following the teachings of worse, one or his skill in the art would actually modify Krueger such that its cups are not supported at different distances from the axis of rotation (see column 1, lines 38-41 of Wirz). Thus, the asserted hypothetical combination of Krueger and Wirz destroys the intended principles of operation of at least one of Wirz and Krueger. (See MPEP 2143). Accordingly, claim 12, as amended, overcomes the rejection.

VII. Conclusion

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 2, 44, 6, 10, 12-16 and 18-19 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Sept. 27, 2007

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276